

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached replacement drawing sheet makes changes to Fig. 31 and replaces the original sheet with Fig. 31.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (Fig. 31)

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-62 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification, claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 20, 23-32, 34, 35 and 38-41, and Fig. 31 are amended. Support for amendments to independent claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 20, 23-32, 34 and 38-41 can be found in the specification and e.g., Figs. 15A-15D, 17, 21 and 33A-F and the corresponding description in the specification. Support for amendments to claims 34 and 35, Fig. 31 and the specification can be found, e.g., Fig. 33B (see P1, P2 and P3). No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Faber at the personal interview held November 2, 2006, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

**I. Claims 1-27, 27-37 and 42-62 Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-27, 27-37 and 42-62 under 35 U.S.C. §101. The Office Action asserts that these claims are not statutory because they did not include a hardware component, which permits the data structure's functionality to be realized. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 20, 27-32 and 34 are each amended to include a central processing unit as suggested by the Examiner during the personal interview. Thus, as agreed during the personal interview, independent claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 20, 27-32 and 34 satisfy these requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101.

Further, the Office Action asserts that claims 1-22, 27-37 and 42-62 do not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. However, independent claims 1, 3, 5, 12 and 20 each include "a layout section for generating a layout by storing the listed information in a plurality of information storage frames arranged in a predetermined layout region" (emphasis added). Similarly, independent claims 27-32 and 34 each include "a layout section for automatically generating a layout by arranging a plurality of information storage frames movably on a

layout region and storing listed information in the information storage frames" (emphasis added). Thus, each of these independent claims produces a useful, concrete and tangible result, i.e., the generation of a layout.

Thus, claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 20, 27-32 and 34, and the claims variously depending therefrom, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

## **II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

### **A. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 27, 33 and 36-41 over Templeman**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 27, 33 and 36-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,845,303 to Templeman. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Templeman does not teach or suggest every feature of claims 1, 3, 27, 33 and 36-41. In particular, as argued during the personal interview, Templeman does not disclose a layout system "wherein the layout section is set to move one of the information storage frames along the set movable direction relative to the other information storage frames, the one of the information storage frames holding its shape when being moved," as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claim 3 (emphasis added). Similarly, Templeman does not teach or suggest a layout system "wherein the layout section automatically forms the information storage frames into a group and automatically sets to move at least one of the information storage frames belonging to the same group so as to have a predetermined relative positional relationship between a center point of the one of the information storage frames with a center point other information storage frames, each of the information storage frames holding its shape when being moved," as recited in independent claim 27 (emphasis added). Further, Templeman does not teach or suggest a layout program that "setting to move the information storage frames, ... each of the information storage frames holding its shape when being moved," as recited in independent claim 38, and as

similarly recited in independent claim 39 (emphasis added). Finally, Templeman does not teach or suggest a layout method that includes "moving the information storage frames so as to have a predetermined relative positional relationship, each of the information storage frames holding its shape when being moved," as recited in independent claim 40, and as similarly recited in independent claim 41 (emphasis added). By setting the movable direction or movable region beforehand, the designer's intentions of the layout are realized and flexibility is achieved (specification at pg. 5, lines 18-21).

As argued during the personal interview, Templeman merely discloses a constraint system that is employed to dynamically size and position frames as data is flowed into them (Templeman at col. 9, lines 1-14). In other words, the frames of Templeman are moved in one or two directions according to the data. However, Templeman does not disclose each of the information storage frames holding its shape when being moved. Thus, Templeman does not disclose the layout system, program or method, as recited in independent claims 1, 3, 27 and 38-41.

Thus, for at least these reasons discussed above and argued during the personal interview, independent claims 1, 3, 27 and 38-41 are patentable over Templeman. Further, claims 3, 27, 33 and 37, which variously depend from claims 1, 3 and 27, are patentable over Templeman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the claims 1, 3 and 27, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**B. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 28-30 over Sams Publishing**

The Office Action rejects claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over "Sams Teach Yourself Microsoft Publishing 2000 in 10 Minutes," to Sams Publishing (Sams Publishing). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sams Publishing does not teach or suggest every feature of claims 28-30. In particular, as argued during the personal interview, Sams Publishing does not teach or suggest a layout system "wherein the layout section automatically forms the information storage frames into a group, automatically arranges the information storage frames, which belong to the same group, laterally on the layout region, and automatically sets to move some or all of the information storage frames vertically so as to align upper ends or lower ends, so that the layout is automatically generated," as recited in independent claim 28, and as similarly recited in independent claims 29 and 30 (emphasis added).

Sams Publishing merely discloses an Arrange and Group Objects option that requires a user to select to group objects together on a page (Sams Publishing at pg. 25). However, Sams Publishing does not disclose automatically generating a layout by automatically forming the information storage frames into a group, automatically arranging the information storage frames, and automatically moving some or all storage frames to generate a layout as recited in independent claims 28-30. Thus, Sams Publishing does not disclose the layout system, as recited in independent claims 28-30.

Thus, for at least these reasons discussed above and argued during the personal interview, claims 28-30 are patentable over Sams Publishing. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 34, 35, 56 and 62 over Templeman**

The Office Action rejects claims 34, 35, 56 and 62 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Templeman. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Templeman does not teach or suggest every feature of claims 34, 35, 56 and 62. As argued during the personal interview, Templeman does not teach or suggest a layout system "wherein when a center point of the information storage frame serving as a reference is displaced by expansion or reduction of the information storage frame, the layout section is

automatically set to displace center points of each of the other information storage frames according to a displacement amount to maintain the predetermined relative positional relationship between the center points, so that the layout is generated," as recited in independent claim 34 (emphasis added). Namely, Templeman does not does teach or suggest a layout system that moves each of the information storage frames so as to maintain the predetermined relative positional relationship between the center points.

As discussed above, Templeman merely discloses a constraint system that is employed to dynamically size and position frames as data is flowed into them (Templeman at col. 9, lines 1-14). For example, the constraint system of Templeman may define the relationship to maintain a fixed size border along the outside of the display as shown in Fig. 5. However, not all relationships in Templeman are fixed (Templeman at col. 8, lines 62-66). Thus, Templeman does not teach or suggest determining a relative positional relationship between the center points of the information storage frames before storing the listed information and displacing the center points of each of the other information storage frames according to a displacement amount to maintain the predetermined relative positional relationship. Thus, Templeman does not disclose the layout system, as recited in independent claim 34.

Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above and argued during the personal interview, claim 34 is patentable over Templeman. Further, claims 35, 56 and 62, which depend from independent claim 34, are patentable over Templeman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 34, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**D. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 5-20 and 23-26 over Templeman and Simmons**

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 4, 5-20 and 23-26 over Templeman in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/003350 to Simmons et al. (Simmons). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Templeman and Simmons, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of claims 2, 4, 5-20 and 23-26. In particular, as argued during the personal interview, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests a layout system "wherein the template can set beforehand a movable direction along which the information storage frame moves on the layout region, ... the layout section is set to move at least one of the plurality of overlapping information storage frames along the set movable direction of the information storage frames based on a setting on the movable direction in the template as recited in independent claim 5, and as similarly recited in independent claim 12. Further, as argued during the personal interview, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests a layout section or method wherein "the layout section is set to move the overlapping information storage frames in the movable region along the set movable direction based on the set movable region in the template to a position where the information storage frames do not overlap each other," as recited in independent claim 20, and similarly recited in independent claims 25 and 26 (emphasis added). Similarly, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests a layout program that "when the plurality of information storage frames overlap each other with the listed information stored in the information storage frames, moving at least one of the plurality of overlapping information storage frames along a set moving direction of the information storage frames so that the plurality of overlapping information storage frames do not overlap each other, the set movable direction of the at least one of the plurality of overlapping information storage frames being set beforehand," as

recited in independent claims 23, and as similarly recited in independent claim 24 (emphasis added). In other words, the moving direction or the moving region can be set beforehand and before an occurrence of a collision.

As acknowledged by the Office Action, Templeman does not disclose these features. However, Simmons does not remedy Templeman's deficiencies. Simmons merely discloses moving the object in a direction that is the shorter distance for resolving the collision between two objects, which may have occurred by increasing the size of the drawing object (Simmons at paragraph [0044]). In other words, Simmons moves in the direction to the shortest distance when the collision occurs. Thus, Simmons does not disclose moving the overlapping information storage frames in the movable region along the set movable direction and the set movable region in the template beforehand, as recited in independent claims 20 and 23-26.

Thus, for at least these reasons discussed above and argued during the personal interview, independent claims 5, 12, 20 and 23-26 are patentable over Templeman and Simmons. Further, claims 2, 4, 6-11 and 13-17, which variously depend from claims 1, 5, and 12, are patentable over Templeman and Simmons at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 5, and 12, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**E. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 21, 22 and 42-45 over Templeman, Simmons and Sams Publishing**

The Office Action rejects claims 21, 22 and 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Templeman in view of Simmons and Sams Publishing. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Templeman, Simmons and Sams Publishing, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of claims 21, 22 and 42-45. Sams Publishing does not remedy the deficiencies of Templeman and Simmons with respect to independent claims 5,



12 and 20. Sams Publishing is cited by the Office Action for only its alleged teachings of a user information storage section. Claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 5, claims 42 and 44 depend from claim 12 and claims 43 and 45 depend from claim 20. Thus, claims 21, 22 and 42-45 are patentable over Templeman, Simmons and Sams Publishing for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 5, 12 and 20, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**F. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 31, 49, 54 and 60 over Sams Publishing, Simmons and Luker**

The Office Action rejects claims 31, 49, 54 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sams Publishing in view of Simmons and further in view of "Microsoft Publisher 2000 Complete User Guide," by Luker (Luker). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sams Publishing, Simmons and Luker, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of claims 31, 49, 54 and 60. In particular, as argued during the personal interview, none of the applied references teaches or suggests a layout system "wherein the layout section automatically forms the information storage frames into a group, automatically arranges the information storage frames, which belong to the same group, vertically on the layout region, and automatically sets to move some or all of the information storage frames laterally so as to align line positions, so that the layout is automatically generated," as recited in independent claim 31 (emphasis added).

As discussed above, Sams Publishing merely discloses an Arrange and Group Objects option that requires a user to select to group objects together on a page (Sams Publishing at pg. 25). Thus, Sams Publishing does not disclose a layout system that automatically generates a layout by automatically forming and arranging the information storage frames into a group, as recited in independent claim 31.

Further, Simmons and Luker do not remedy Sams Publishing's deficiencies. Luker is cited by the Office Action for only its alleged teaching of text, and Simmons is not cited by the Office Action for this rejection. Thus, none of the applied references teaches or suggests the layout system recited in independent claim 31.

Thus, for at least these reasons discussed above and argued during the personal interview, claim 31 is patentable over Sams Publishing, Simmons and Luker. Further, claims 49, 54 and 60, which depend from claim 31, are also patentable over Sams Publishing, Simmons and Luker for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 31, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**G. §103(a) Rejection of Claim 32 over Sams Publishing**

The Office Action rejects claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sams Publishing. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sams Publishing does not teach or suggest every feature of claim 32. Sams Publishing does not teach or suggest a layout system "wherein the layout section automatically forms the information storage frames into a group, automatically arranges the information storage frames, which belong to the same group, diagonally on the layout region, and automatically moves some or all of the information storage frames so as to connect corners, so that the layout is generated," as recited in independent claim 32 (emphasis added).

As discussed above, Sams Publishing merely discloses an Arrange and Group Objects option that requires a user to select to group objects together on a page (Sams Publishing at pg. 25). However, Sams Publishing does not disclose automatically generating a layout by automatically forming the information storage frames into a group, automatically arranging the information storage frames, and automatically moving some or all storage frames to

generate a layout. Thus, Sams Publishing does not disclose a layout system recited in independent claim 32.

Thus, for at least these reasons discussed above and argued during the personal interview, claim 32 is patentable over Sams Publishing. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**H. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 46-48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61 over Sams Publishing and Templeman**

The Office Action rejects claims 46-48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sams Publishing in view of Templeman. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sams Publishing and Templeman, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of claims 46-48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61. Templeman does not remedy the deficiencies discussed above with respect to independent claims 28-30. Templeman is cited by the Office Action for only its alleged teaching of information storage frames. Claims 46-48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61 variously depend from independent claims 28-30. Thus, claims 46-48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61 are patentable over Sams Publishing and Templeman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 28-30, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hs

Attachments:

Replacement Sheet (Fig. 31)  
Request for Continued Examination

Date: November 8, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--